Case 1:17-cr-00350-KBF Document 161 Filed 07/06/17 Page 1 of 50

H69KDZHC 1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK 2 3 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, 4 17 CR 350 (KBF) V. 5 ZURAB DZHANASHVILI, AKAKI UBILAVA, HAMLET UGLAVA, MIKHEIL TORADZE, AVTANDIL 6 KANADASHVILI, NAZO 7 GAPRINDASHVILI, ARTUR VINOKUROV, EVGHENI MELMAN, 8 ZURAB BUZIASHVILI, AZER ARSLANOUK, BAKAI MARAT-UULU, 9 ANDRIY PETRUSHYN, LEVAN MAKASHVILI, DENYS DAVYDOV, 10 ALEX MITSELMAKHER, YURIY LERNER, AVTANDIL KHURTSIDZE, 11 SEMYON SARAIDAROV, 12 Defendants. ----x 13 14 New York, N.Y. June 9, 2017 15 12:30 p.m. 16 Before: 17 HON. KATHERINE B. FORREST, 18 District Judge 19 20 21 22 23 24 25

H69KDZHC

1	ADDEADANCEC
2	APPEARANCES
3	JOON H. KIM, Acting United States Attorney for the
4	Southern District of New York ANDREW ADAMS
5	ANDREW MARK THOMAS Assistant United States Attorneys
6 7	FEDERAL DEFENDERS OF NEW YORK Attorneys for Defendant Dzhanashvili AMY GALLICCHIO
8	DONNA NEWMAN Attorney for Defendant Ubilava
10 11	RICHARD MA Attorney for Defendant Uglava
12	BOBBI STERNHEIM Attorney for Defendant Toradze
13 14	DAVID GREENFIELD Attorney for Defendant Kanadashvili
15	LANCE LAZZARO Attorney for Defendant Gaprindashvili
16 17	GERALD DI CHIARA Attorney for Defendant Vinokurov
18 19	IRVING COHEN Attorney for Defendant Melman BY: DONNA NEWMAN
20	EVANS D. PRIESTON Attorney for Defendant Buziashvili
21	LOUIS FASULO Attorney for Defendant Arslanouk
22	JOHN WALDRON Attorney for Defendant Marat-Uulu BY: EDWARD WALDRON
24 25	ARNOLD LEVINE Attorney for Defendant Petrushyn

H69KDZHC

1	APPEARANCES (Continued)
2	XAVIER DONALDSON Attorney for Defendant Makashvili
3	SUSAN KELLMAN Attorney for Defendant Davydov
5	ANDREW FRISCH Attorney for Defendant Mitselmakher
6 7	CHARLES MILLER Attorney for Defendant Lerner
8	GUY OKSENHENDLER Attorney for Defendant Khurtsidze
9	LISA SCOLARI Attorney for Defendant Saraidarov
11	
12	ALSO PRESENT:
13 14	YANA AGOUREEV, Russian Interpreter MAYA BERIDZE, Georgian Interpreter LASHA GEGECHKORI, Georgian Interpreter
15	NASHAUN RICHARDS, FBI ROBERT HANRATTY, FBI ERIN OTTERSON, FBI
16	BRUCE TURPIN, FBI ASHLEY COSME, Pretrial
17 18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
Į.	ı

THE DEPUTY CLERK: In the matter of United States of 1 America versus Zurab Dzhanashvili, 17 CR 350. 2 3 Please state your names for the record. 4 THE COURT: Actually before you do, hold on one 5 I've got my seating chart, which I just want to make sure I've got right in front of me. 6 7 Okay. Go ahead. 8 MR. ADAMS: Good afternoon, your Honor. Andrew Adams 9 and Andrew Thomas, for the government. And with us today at 10 counsel table are a number of FBI agents. This is Nashaun 11 Richards, Robert Hanratty, Erin Otterson, and Bruce Turpin, all 12 of the New York FBI. 13 THE COURT: All right. In that order; am I right? 14 Yes, your Honor. MR. ADAMS: THE COURT: 15 Okay. Good afternoon, all of you. 16 MR. RICHARDS: Good afternoon, Judge. 17 THE COURT: Let's start, Mr. Di Chiara, with you, and 18 let's work our way across the tables. MR. Di CHIARRA: Good afternoon, your Honor. For 19 20 Artur Vinokurov, who is seated in the front row, second one in

MR. Di CHIARRA: Good afternoon, your Honor. For Artur Vinokurov, who is seated in the front row, second one in from your Honor's, I guess -- well, furthest from your Honor, the second one in.

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: All right. I think he's nodding his head at me.

MR. Di CHIARRA: That's right. Thank you, Judge.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.

MR. MA: Good afternoon, Judge. Richard Ma, appearing on behalf of Mr. Hamlet Uglava. Mr. Uglava is in the second row closest to you.

THE COURT: Good afternoon, both of you.

MS. GALLICCHIO: Good afternoon, your Honor. Federal Defenders, by Amy Gallicchio, for Mr. Dzhanashvili. He is seated in the first row furthest from you.

THE COURT: Good afternoon.

MR. LEVINE: Good afternoon, your Honor. Arnold Levine, for Andriy Petrushyn. He's closer to you.

THE COURT: All right. Good afternoon.

MR. WALDRON: Good afternoon, your Honor. Ed Waldron, for Mr. Bakai Marat-Uulu, in place of John Burke. Mr. Uulu has consented to my representation for today. He is seated in the back row and is nodding his head right now.

THE COURT: All right. Good afternoon, both of you.

MR. OKSENHENDLER: Good afternoon, your Honor. Guy Oksenhendler, for Mr. Khurtsidze. He's seated third in the jury box from your left in the front row.

THE COURT: Good afternoon.

MR. DONALDSON: Your Honor, good afternoon. Xavier Donaldson, for Mr. Makashvili. He is in the second row, middle seat.

THE COURT: I'm just looking for your name,

DEFENDANT MITSELMAKHER: Good afternoon.

for Mr. Mitselmakher, who is to my left.

23

24

25

MR. FRISCH: Good afternoon, Judge. Andrew Frisch,

THE COURT: Good afternoon. 1 2 And we've got? MR. PRIESTON: Evans Prieston. I'm for 3 4 Mr. Buziashvili, who is present next to me, your Honor. 5 THE COURT: All right. Thank you. 6 MS. NEWMAN: Good afternoon, your Honor. Donna R. 7 Newman, on behalf of Akaki Ubilava, who is to my right. And I'm standing in for Irving Cohen, who represents 8 9 Evgheni Melmen, who's standing to my left. Mr. Melmen has 10 consented to my appearance on his behalf. 11 THE COURT: Thank you. And good afternoon. 12 I think that is -- one more? 13 MR. GREENFIELD: Yes, your Honor. Good afternoon. 14 David Greenfield, for Mr. Kanadashvili, who's standing to my left. 15 THE COURT: Good afternoon. 16 17 MS. SCOLARI: Lisa Scolari, for Semyon Saraidarov. Good afternoon, your Honor. He's right here, next to me. 18 THE COURT: Terrific. Good afternoon. 19 20 Now I think we've actually got all the rows, right? 21 THE DEPUTY CLERK: Yes. 22 THE COURT: One thing I want to say before we proceed 23 further is I do know that certain defendants are wearing the 24 equipment that allows them to hear the translation. From time 25 to time, the battery runs out, or you need to turn up the

sound, or something happens, and you might not actually be able to hear. If that occurs, please raise your hand, or nudge your lawyer, or otherwise make it clear to us, if you're over here in the jury box, that you can't hear, and we'll get it fixed, all right? It's very important that everybody be able to hear everything today.

I'd like to start off by -- let me just tell you folks what I understand the state of play is. I understand that each of the defendants who are here and present in court today have been presented and arraigned, and, therefore, that our task right now is to have an initial conference where we'll talk about the nature of the discovery in this case, a schedule for the production of that discovery, and then next steps.

So, that's what I think the agenda is. Tell me if someone hasn't been presented or arraigned first, and then we'll resolve any issues that may be open there.

MR. ADAMS: Certainly. No one in the courtroom today -- everyone in the courtroom, rather, has been presented and arraigned already. There are two people today who will go through the same process, and I will contact chambers to set up a conference for them as well.

THE COURT: All right. Terrific.

Then let's move on to a description from the government of the nature of the discovery in this case and your plan for production.

MR. ADAMS: Certainly, your Honor.

With permission, and to give some context to the discovery, I'd like to give the Court and the defendants today sort of an overview of the case generally, and that will, I think, make it a little easier to understand exactly what kinds of discovery categories we're talking about.

THE COURT: All right. That's fine. Just make sure you speak slowly. Just because of the translators, extra slowly. You're not speaking particularly quickly, but I want to make sure --

MR. ADAMS: Certainly.

THE COURT: $\ --$ the translators are able to get everything.

MR. ADAMS: Certainly.

And I will look over. If there are problems, just raise a hand.

So, this is a racketeering case principally. It centers around a core group of defendants, and, in particular, one defendant, a man named Razhden Shulaya, who's not in the courtroom today. He was arrested on Wednesday at the same time as the majority of the defendants here, but in the District of Nevada. He's been detained pending transport, and we expect him in the district as soon as the marshals can produce him here.

The crimes with which what we are referring to as the

Shulaya enterprise were engaged are vast and varied, and I will go through a couple of categories. It's laid out in the indictment. There's some overlap between them, and each of these categories involve usually overlapping membership within sort of the lower tiers of the Shulaya enterprise.

At the core of the investigation was originally an illegal gambling establishment. There's a poker house in Brighton Beach. The poker house acted as kind of a headquarters for the Shulaya enterprise, and it hosted an illegal poker game on a regular basis. There were a number of the defendants involved in running or managing the poker game.

From this illegal gambling activity, a number of other crimes stemmed. There was extortion of people who engaged in gambling at the poker house. People who ran up debts in the tens of thousands of dollars to the Shulaya enterprise were extorted, threatened, intimidated by members of the Shulaya enterprise, in order for the enterprise to recoup its losses or recoup, rather, its debts owed by those people.

The use of the poker house also included a safe and secure, or what the enterprise believed was a secure, location for acts of violence. These related to the poker house or the enterprise's efforts to instill a sense of fear among its lower-level participants of Shulaya and his core group, such that when people went out of line, from the perspective of Shulaya, they would be injured, and in some cases, badly

injured. This is captured on video in several instances.

There is one instance in which a confidential source himself was actually assaulted, both by Shulaya himself and by

Mr. Khurtsidze, who will be the subject of a bail discussion later today.

The poker house had a surveillance camera. The surveillance camera was attempted to be dismantled and thrown away as a result of some arrests in an unrelated or a different and separate case, a different separate investigation, that took place across the river in the Eastern District of

New York. Sometime in October or November of last year, there were some arrests, and the poker house shut down. Shulaya took the video system, tried to get rid of it by giving it to the confidential source. So, the interior video of the poker house is available, and if this goes to trial, the jury is going to see instances of sometimes brutal violence in furtherance of the enterprise.

THE COURT: So, who was maintaining these tapes? This was a surveillance setup that was set up by the alleged poker house and maintained by them?

MR. ADAMS: Correct.

THE COURT: And happened to just capture whatever was going on inside the poker house within the view of the camera on tape?

MR. ADAMS: Correct. There are two ways in which this

was accessible. Even before they attempted to throw away the server — I say tape, but it's an electronic digital surveillance system. Even before that, the FBI, through a confidential source, had access to the video footage from the surveillance because the enterprise had essentially an iPhone app where you could go and look at live what was playing inside the poker house if you had access and permissions to look at the interior of the house. The Shulaya enterprise gave that access to a confidential source, and, so, it was easy and available to look at any point and see what was happening inside the poker house.

THE COURT: Was that material then retained not only on the server, but, also, was it put onto a cloud someplace in addition?

MR. ADAMS: I don't believe it's on a cloud. The server is maintained and in FBI custody. We were able to capture portions of video. The CS could show that video to the agents and record certain snippets of it. It's not the entirety predisposition of the server itself.

That's just the video, it's not audio. There was no Title 3 or anything on that particular device.

In addition to the poker house, there was some other after-hours clubs and social clubs that the Shulaya enterprise was engaged in. There are investments by Shulaya himself and other members of the enterprise into a number of clubs.

Mr. Azer Arslanouk is one of the defendants here today, was involved in managing certain of those clubs. Those clubs hosted narcotics sales. In some situations, the Shulaya enterprise's protection was sought for other clubs that would offer, again, narcotics sales, and in one instance, there are consensually obtained recordings discussing the use of the Shulaya enterprise's protection for prostitution.

There were, by Mr. Arslanouk's own words, bribes being made to law enforcement in some instances in order to ensure the protection for that side of the Shulaya enterprise.

In addition to this extortion racquet, the gambling racket, and the violence surrounding the poker house, there are a number of other schemes that the Shulaya enterprise engages in. A lot of the same people involved in what I just described are also involved in these other schemes.

There is -- and I will lump these three together -there is an interstate transportation of stolen property
scheme, there's a contraband cigarette receipt and distribution
scheme, and there's a narcotics charge in here as well, in
which one member who's charged in the RICO is also charged with
just a stand-alone narcotics case or narcotics charge.

With respect to the cigarettes, various members of the enterprise would receive contraband cigarettes or unmarked cigarettes. These were actually being provided by the FBI and distributed through the Shulaya enterprise. The conspiracy

understood these to be contraband, stolen cigarettes. And we are talking about merchandise somewhere on the order of over a million dollars worth of contraband tobacco.

In addition to cigarettes themselves, there is a cargo theft scheme here, which is a little more complicated, and involved merchandise and cargo, essentially, of any kind. The idea was that different shipments of any sort of cargo would be stolen using a particular method of impersonating a trucking company or pretending to be a legitimate trucking company, putting in a bid to win the right to go pick up a shipment of whatever the bid might be for, and then simply purloining, stealing, the shipment.

So, the indictment talks about one of these incidents involving approximately 10,000 pounds of chocolate confections. These were peanut butter cups that were being supplied by one company and intended for delivery to its customer. The Shulaya enterprise, certain members of it, put in a bid using false names, false identification, won the bid, picked up the shipment, and took it to a warehouse in Brooklyn, where they then sold it, or believed they were selling it, to a black market distributor that was, in fact, a confidential source.

The enterprise went beyond that one sale. There are also intercepted wire calls, which I'll talk about in a moment, involving the receipt and sale of such things as large shipments of laptops, light bulbs in one instance, and chicken

feed, with a D, in enormous quantities. I believe some of that was actually found in a search warrant executed at the same time as the arrest.

This cargo theft scheme I mentioned took advantage of false identification and fake names. There is, in addition to this cargo theft and the cigarette scheme, a false ID counterfeit credit card and forged check scheme that, again, an overlapping group of members of the enterprise were engaged in.

Certain members of the enterprise, including people who are here today, were involved in the manufacture of false identification documents, the creation of counterfeit credit cards, obtaining forged checks for cashing at various locations in and around the New York area and in and around the Las Vegas area, as well as in Florida, at different times during the course of the conspiracy.

Moving from those schemes to one that has a very different sort of flavor, there is a wire fraud charge in the indictment. It's also listed among the overt acts in the RICO conspiracy, and I will refer to it as the casino scheme. The casino scheme involves obtaining electronic slot machine samples, an actual electronic slot machine, or the programs, the motherboard of the device itself. Members of the enterprise and people they hire take the inner workings of those machines, copy them, mirror those machines, study their inner workings, and essentially figure out what is supposedly a

random number generator and how it works. It's not entirely a random number generator, and so they're able to analyze that machine and figure out, based on what a machine in a casino is displaying at any given moment, where within the life of the random number generator — seemingly random number generator that machine in the casino is, such that someone sitting in the casino can speak to a member of the enterprise or somebody we believe in Russia with access to these programs, and that person can say, bet now. The person sitting in the casino in realtime places a bet and wins effectively every time, turning the slot machine from a game of chance into an ATM.

The evidence on this is going to include both surveilled deliveries of a sample slot machine to the Shulaya enterprise, wiretapped recordings between Shulaya and multiple members of the enterprise regarding the inner workings of the scheme, regarding the effectiveness of some of the software and hardware used in mirroring the slot machines, and discussing the effectiveness of the scheme itself with people actually in the casino while they're winning, testing the scheme itself.

I'll talk about some seizure evidence, but those will include, in some cases, motherboards of slot machines of exactly the kind I'm talking about.

Finally, and really quite different from anything I've talked about so far, certain members of the enterprise, including Mr. Dzhanashvili, Mr. Buziashvili, and others, were

engaged in what I'll refer to as --

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: When you're saying Dzhanashvili, that's D-Z-H-A-N, correct?

MR. ADAMS: Correct, your Honor. Yes.

THE COURT: All right. Continue.

MR. ADAMS: This robbery scheme worked as follows: There was a female coconspirator, not charged in this indictment, who was effectively employed by the Shulaya enterprise, and most directly by Mr. Dzhanashvili, to seduce and lure different men who people believed the enterprise believed to be in possession of money or had access to money. The idea was to lure these people to a hotel, or casino, or someplace where this coconspirator would be in a position to drug, or knock out, or if need be, just physically overwhelm the person I'll call the mark, with the understanding being that we will steal this person's money, steal this person's credit cards. There are wire intercept calls really in great detail and with some explicit facts about how the scheme would work, including discussions about how to use chloroform gas in order to knock somebody out, where to obtain it, and exactly how they would subdue and rob these marks.

There will be evidence of surveillance of the marks by other members of the enterprise, including Mr. Saraidarov, Mr. Uglava in some instances. These marks would frequent places where those two people worked. They would alert other

members of the conspiracy to the presence of those people, so that this coconspirator could be introduced to those potential victims.

So far as we know, the FBI was able to intercept and stop any actual robberies from occurring through the course of the conspiracy as a result of exactly how express the details over the wire were.

Those are, I think, the principal schemes charged in the indictment. They really cover the background to the discovery, and unless the Court has questions about that aspect, I'll move to the --

THE COURT: No. Why don't you go on to the more granular details of the discovery.

MR. ADAMS: Sure.

So, this has been an investigation that the FBI has been working on since approximately 2014. It has involved the use of numerous confidential sources. Those confidential sources have obtained approximately — well over 200 hours of consensually recorded body wire recordings. Those are coupled with surveillance. In some instances, they're coupled with photographs. In some instances, it's coupled with video of these meetings corroborating the surveillance itself or the recordings themselves. And we have at this point draft transcripts of much of that and summaries of much of that, which we'll be in a position to begin producing shortly.

THE COURT: What language are these in? 1 Russian, Georgian, English in some 2 MR. ADAMS: 3 instances, but overwhelmingly in Russian and Georgian. 4 THE COURT: When you say you have draft transcripts, 5 do you have draft transcripts with translations or only into 6 the first language? 7 MR. ADAMS: The former, your Honor, into English. THE COURT: All right. 8 9 MR. ADAMS: In December of last year, we began a 10 series of judicially authorized wiretap intercepts over a number of phones. Those continued until Wednesday of this 11 12 So, we have approximately six months of wiretap 13 recordings. Those began with six target phones that went down 14 to five target phones, I believe, after one month. There were three owners of those multiple phones - Ms. Kanadashvili had 15 her phone intercepted for one month, Mr. Shulaya himself at 16 17 various points had up to four phones being intercepted, and Mr. Dzhanashvili's phone was intercepted for the entire period 18 19 as well. 20 THE COURT: How many separate initial wire 21 applications as opposed to renewals? How many are we talking 22 about? 23 MR. ADAMS: One single application that covered all 24 the phones.

All right.

THE COURT:

25

MR. ADAMS: The initial application covered only wire intercepts. We expanded to electronic intercepts as well over certain lines.

There are, in the process of burning to DVDs and hard drives, the conversations themselves. The line sheets should be prepared early next week. I will say that the volume is enormous. There are, over Mr. Dzhanashvili's phones alone, approximately 11,000 pages of line sheets that we have. We have detailed translations into English for many conversations. We have summaries of the others in English. We don't have detailed translations of every single conversation that happened.

THE COURT: All right. Are the 11,000 pages -- no, let me ask you this: Are people talking in code, or are they going to be searchable in some way that's going to be meaningful?

MR. ADAMS: They are both, frankly.

THE COURT: Both?

MR. ADAMS: There's plenty of speaking in code or speaking sort of in very clipped ways, including discussions about how we should not speak about this on the phone over and over. It is all word searchable. So, if you know phone numbers — and we will be helping defense counsel act as a spotlight for relevant phone numbers — it should be easy to search by phone numbers. There are particular nicknames or

aliases that we've learned throughout the course of the wiretap that we can assist defense counsel in working through.

So, at first glance, I imagine it may seem opaque, but we will be here to help defense counsel work through that.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. ADAMS: That 11,000, by the way, that is only on Mr. Dzhanashvili's phone. Mr. Shulaya had four phones at one point. I believe there's something on the order of 60,000 calls and SMS messages intercepted over the course of six months.

Geolocation data for those cell phones and the cell phones of many other of the defendants here today will be provided. Approximately 30 different cell phones for which geolocation data was obtained at different points. And that stuff becomes relevant in a number of ways, including placing people at particular check-cashing locations or the areas placing people at casinos that are of interest, at cigarette deals, the movement of interstate stolen property. The geolocation data comes into play in that way.

There are a large volume of pen registers and the data from that -- I think it's 45 lines over the course of about two and a half years -- just showing the numbers and sort of header information without contacts between suspects in the case.

There is the video from the poker house that I spoke about earlier. There's video surveillance from different

casinos that we were aware that the casino scheme was being executed at more recently. So, those casinos were able to give us surveillance video of enterprise members engaged in the fraud.

There are records related to the sale of these contraband cigarettes sold through and to the Shulaya enterprise. The bank records and records from Western Union and MoneyGram reflecting the movement of money by the enterprise.

THE COURT: And can you give me a sense of volume as to those and whether they are going to be primarily electronic form?

MR. ADAMS: They will be in electronic form.

Currently, it's not in a particularly enormous volume, and there are some spreadsheets associated with those that make it a little easier. I will say as a result of the search warrants earlier this week, I imagine that that aspect - bank records,

Western Union - will grow substantially in the next few weeks.

There will be some records from these trucking companies and shipping companies that were the victims of the cargo theft scheme that I spoke about earlier. That's not particularly voluminous. There are contemporaneous records from the shipping companies saying we got a bid from this person, and then that shipment went missing. There's some related records to things like the phone numbers used to

conduct that scheme, the email addresses used to conduct that scheme, but, again, that's not a massive amount of material.

One will be larger, and we are really only now in a position to even start working on this as a result of the search warrants that were executed on Wednesday.

THE COURT: You said only the search warrants that were executed on?

MR. ADAMS: Wednesday.

THE COURT: On Wednesday?

MR. ADAMS: This past Wednesday.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. ADAMS: Actually, before I get to that, I'll mention, we had obtained email account search warrants on three different accounts over the course of the investigation, one belonging to Mr. Zurab Buziashvili, one related to -- I only know it by the email account, it's not in somebody's particular name and is anonymized, but it's related to the credit card and the card theft fraud, but we'll be providing that, and in one account in the name of Mr. Savgir, who's currently a fugitive. Mr. Savgir's role with respect to the enterprise was the creation of false identification documents and counterfeit credit cards primarily. Those email accounts reflect the receipt of things like photographs for use in creating false identifications, including photographs of people who actually were at casinos and other places that would cash checks and, in

fact, did cash checks with other people related to the enterprise.

Mr. Savgir's email account is not particularly huge in this case. We limited the time period for which we requested records from that account. I think that the order of emails there is approximately a thousand emails. It's not 10,000 or 100,000.

So, with that, I'll talk for a moment about the recent search warrants of a couple of premises that were executed this past Wednesday.

We had five different premises subject to search warrants in the Eastern District and in the District of New Jersey. The premises in the District of New Jersey is Shulaya's personal residence. And it was, frankly, just a trove of electronic information and devices. Agents seized approximately —

THE COURT: Can you give me -- you're about to say?

MR. ADAMS: Yes, I think I'm about to answer.

Agents seized approximately 34 different cellular different telephones, ten different iPads, hard drives, USB keys, and other electronic devices, drugs, what appears to be cocaine or the paraphernalia related to prior possession of cocaine.

THE COURT: In personal use quantity or something that is suggestive of something else?

MR. ADAMS: I was just looking at this before we came over. Individually, they would be personal use, I would think, but it is quite a number of vials. We're still looking to see how it was packaged and whether we think it was distribution.

A skimming device, which is relevant to the counterfeit credit card scam. Skimming devices were found in other premises, which I will discuss in a moment, and are integral to running these counterfeit credit card scams and obtaining stolen credit card information.

Western Union receipts along the same lines that we had understood Shulaya to be moving money through the wire and through earlier investigation. There are two strong boxes or safes that are not just your Wal-Mart brand safes, they weren't cracked immediately by the FBI. The FBI is still working to get into the safes pursuant to the warrant, so I'm not sure what's in those just yet, but the agents did find a crossbow in Mr. Shulaya's residence. The reason that it is relevant is that it was a present from another for — or extremely high level figure within the Russian organized crime world to Mr. Shulaya as a birthday present.

So, for the moment, I don't know what the volume of data or information on the iPads or phones will be --

THE COURT: All right.

MR. ADAMS: -- but we will be obtaining a follow-up warrant for those electronic devices, and we can report to the

Court as soon as we know what's inside. And it may well be that certain of the devices are either empty or locked in a way that we can't reasonably crack them.

THE COURT: Then you've got four places in the E.D.N.Y. in Brooklyn?

MR. ADAMS: Yes, your Honor.

Mr. Dzhanashvili's residence was the subject of a proceeds warrant. It included fake identifications, false state identifications, thumb drives, which have not yet been searched -- again, with all of these electronic devices that I'm mentioning, we're going to be getting a follow-up search warrant for all of this -- and a slap-on GPS device. It appears to be of the kind that you would use to track a car. We are, at this point, not sure if it contains any relevant data. We need to consult with the manufacturer to see what might be kept on that. That's Mr. Dzhanashvili's residence.

Mr. Melman's residence was the subject of a warrant.

Mr. Melman was primarily of interest in the course of the investigation with respect to the casino fraud. Mr. Shulaya and Mr. Melman are in contact frequently over recorded conversations and the wiretap discussing the effectiveness of some of the servers, essentially troubleshooting the servers as they're attempting to execute the scheme. And Mr. Melman's apartment was one hub from which that sort of troubleshooting and technical support was being offered.

Mr. Melman's residence included devices consistent with the casino fraud. It included devices consistent with the counterfeit credit card scheme as well, including devices that appear to be either skimmers or other electronic devices associated with the counterfeit and credit card scheme. And there's a motherboard of the same kind that is associated with a particular kind of electronic slot machine. That was also found in Mr. Melman's apartment.

There are approximately -- well, there were actually well over ten devices -- I don't have the exact number --

THE COURT: In total?

MR. ADAMS: In total.

-- in Mr. Melman's apartment.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. ADAMS: Mr. Savgir's apartment was the subject of a warrant. Mr. Savgir's apartment included a large amount of manufacturing equipment for false identifications and counterfeit credit cards. It included very high-end printers, it included state holograms of the sort that you might see on the front of your driver's license from various states, all very well organized in his apartment, photo printers, laminators and sample laminate, all consistent with the creation of false identifications, a number of flash drives, which have not yet been searched, and a guide to the appearance of various state identification documents. It's the kind of

thing that you might have if you were a bartender to check IDs.

It's also the kind of thing that you might have if you're creating fake IDs.

Finally, there were two different premises both associated with Mr. Marat-Uulu, who's charged currently in the narcotics conspiracy in this case. There is a separate complaint that the Court has as well that relates to a number of firearms charges in a murder-for-hire conspiracy. We charged that by complaint because the facts sort of percolated at a later time when we were going to the grand jury, but we intend to supersede that as well. But Mr. Marat-Uulu's apartments were searched in the course of the arrest on this indictment.

And there were basically two different schemes reflected here. One has to do with a fake charity scam that Mr. Marat-Uulu has discussed in conversations with different — with a source. That's essentially exactly what it sounds like, and it purports to be a charity. It takes money, it's not actually a charity.

And then in Mr. Marat-Uulu's other apartment, there were a trove of devices and equipment associated with false identifications and counterfeit credit cards, including skimming devices, USB keys that have not yet been searched, and consistent with what we had understood from some information from a confidential source, there was mail from Russia that had

arrived at Mr. Marat-Uulu's residence. When opened, it looked to be a voltometer, something for measuring the voltage of electronic devices. When that device itself was opened, what was actually inside of it is more credit card skimming devices and essentially more devices for the use in this counterfeit credit card scam concealed to be smuggled into the country.

Your Honor, finally, there is one defendant who was incarcerated at the time of the arrest on Wednesday. This is Mr. Suyunov. He's currently in the Southern District of Florida, and we will be writting him up here along with anybody else who's detained in Florida. There are three other defendants down there right now. Mr. Suyunov was actually arrested earlier. He was caught by local law enforcement in the Miami area in possession of counterfeit credit cards, devices. A laptop on his person was searched at that time pursuant to a search warrant from the Southern District of Florida. It also contains spreadsheets and documents that appear to be stolen account information, among other relevant data and information.

I think that that covers the scope of discovery and the major categories of the kinds of discovery that we anticipate.

THE COURT: All right. Why don't you describe for us your plan with production. I'm sure that you've got something in mind.

MR. ADAMS: Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I do think that this is a case where appointing a discovery coordinator is going to be useful and helpful just given the volume of electronic discovery and the various formats. What we're going to do in the meantime is begin to download the recordings. That will take a few days just to download them. And to the extent that we don't have a discovery coordinator to mass-produce this for approximately 30 defendants, we'll start making the copies to provide to defense counsel. We're going to start with the recordings, start with the transcripts, and start with the surveillance photos and videos, which we're going to, in the first instance, provide on DVDs. If we can't get a discovery coordinator in short order, then what I think we'll do is ask for hard drives from people, so that we can put -- so we don't have to drown people in DVDs, and so we don't have to break up email accounts and things like that.

And we will be starting on that -- we have already started on that, frankly. We have many of the recordings, and the line sheets will be coming shortly. I can start making copies of those things today.

THE COURT: So, you'll essentially put everything that you have received so far in one form or another onto a hard drive. Putting aside for the moment other potential forms of discovery, you're able to put everything onto a hard drive or

hard drives and then produce those?

MR. ADAMS: Yes.

THE COURT: How long would it take you to do that for one? And then tell me about the duplication timing necessary to make the copies. Once again, I'm not suggesting that we don't have somebody who fulfills a centralized role, but I just want to get a sense of the timing on the outside.

MR. ADAMS: Sure.

So, to fully download the recordings will take at least a couple of days. Just the speed by which those files transfer will take a while, and I expect that copying 30 copies of it is going to take probably a couple of weeks to completely complete, but we have started that and will continue that today and over the next few days.

The line sheets will go faster. Those themselves do take a little while to download, but we should be able to get those and make copies. I am hopeful by the end of next week, we can have copies for all of the defendants, so that people can at least begin reviewing the draft transcripts and the draft summaries.

Similarly, the geolocation data, pen register information, there's quite a bit of it, but just the nature of that data shouldn't take as long.

THE COURT: So, a couple of weeks?

MR. ADAMS: I think so for that, yes.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. ADAMS: Similarly, the email files are not massive. We can copy those relatively quickly and then start duplicating them on the same timeline as the geolocation data. The format there differs, I'll say. Several of the accounts are from Gmail and Google in in-box format, another is from a Yahoo account, and I don't know off the top of my head if that's the same format or not.

THE COURT: So, then, let's approach it this way:

What I am interested in is, just so I understand the outside

time frame, if the government -- and I understand you've

commenced this process already -- were to take everything that

is going to constitute the discovery in this case, and to put

it on hard drives, and to duplicate it 30-plus times, you need

a month to six weeks to do that?

MR. ADAMS: Yes.

THE COURT: Am I right?

MR. ADAMS: I think that's correct.

THE COURT: Okay. So, let's call it six weeks.

And you can roll out the production; is that right?

MR. ADAMS: Absolutely.

THE COURT: And you would be able to roll out the production in a similar way for similar defendants; in other words, line sheets could potentially, along with whatever else is available, geolocation information, go out within a couple

of weeks, while the recordings might take longer; is that correct?

MR. ADAMS: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right.

So, that gives me a sense as to volume, which is very significant --

MR. ADAMS: Yes.

THE COURT: -- and the number of issues that may be involved in review.

Okay. The one thing that it sounds like -- well, was there something else you wanted to say or -- I just want to make a couple of comments.

MR. ADAMS: No, your Honor. There are obviously a few defendants who are at least detained for the moment, and we'll be working with the MDC or the MCC, as necessary, to make sure that they have access to all the same stuff on the same timeline.

THE COURT: Okay.

So, here is what I am going to suggest: We've got a large group of people here who will want to both be heard on a number of these issues and talk to their lawyers about a number of these issues. What I'm going to suggest is that because the government has raised the question of what I am going to call a centralized repository for some of this discovery information, I'm going to have counsel and the government confer on that and

make an application, if you folks want to proceed that way, to me in a letter, which people can join in. That way, I would be able to understand, quite clearly, what you're thinking, who it is, and what responsibilities this individual or individuals would have, and, importantly, what responsibilities they would not have. As I'm sure you folks are aware, discovery issues, including for large cases, has been something that the district has grappled with increasingly, and the use of individuals as centralized places for cases to orient themselves around has been something that people have talked about, used to varying degrees. There are, in my view, some ways that that is done efficiently and appropriately, and there are some ways in which that can be set up to create problems that you want to avoid.

So, rather than going into any of that now, why don't I ask the government to lead a discussion in whatever form, through email, whether or not defense counsel is going to appoint a point person to have a discussion about that, however you folks want to do it. But when the application is made, I just want to let you folks know I'll be looking very carefully at it, and, in particular, if an application is made, at ensuring that each defense counsel retains primary responsibility, and ultimately for their client, exclusive responsibility for the review of discovery and for the assurance that all appropriate discovery has been received and is available. In other words, you can't put off onto somebody

else negotiations with the government around discovery for you because different clients have different interests, and there's an enormous number of different interests sitting in this room, and you can't have somebody else do your discovery review for you who is centralized with every other defendant.

However, there may be ways in which efficiencies are gained, and I want to leave that open to you folks to make that suggestion. So, let me put that onto the top of the government's to-do list, but what I'm going to suggest, also, is that the government may need to work on two tracks, which is getting a set of this as a master set ready for production because if it takes too long for you folks to work out your application, or if you folks and I don't agree on what's appropriate, and it either takes multiple iterations to come to some resolution or if I ultimately disagree with it, I don't want that application to be the creation of a big delaying factor in the production of discovery.

So, the second thing is, I want the government to ensure that it is creating a master set on hard drives that can be duplicated in relatively short order, however many number of times you're going to need to be able to do that, and to ensure, in all events, on their calendar that discovery is produced — that which has been discussed today and which has been received to date is produced in six weeks.

Now, I would expect, as Mr. Adams has already

previewed, that there is going to be additions, both things which will fall out of the review of the five search warrants recently executed, what's on the various electronic devices will have to be assessed, that may take a little bit more time, so we'll check in on that, as well as the bank records subpoena, it sounds like there's more to come there, and there's already an expanded array of that that's anticipated. So, I don't expect that every single piece of paper relevant to this case is going to be produced in six weeks, but the bulk of what you've already described, Mr. Adams, I would expect would be produced within six weeks.

So, get me your application on this centralized person, if that's what people decide, some or all, you don't have to all be onboard with it, but if that's the way you folks want to agree, get me that application, as necessary.

So, discovery in six weeks.

The other thing that I'm going to suggest is that I do think, assuming that people have discovery in six weeks, that people will not know whether or not they want to bring any motions to suppress potentially for, I would say, probably 90 days at least. This is just motions to suppress. I'm putting aside for the moment other potential motions because I think that the review of discovery here is going to be very, very significant.

So, what I'd like to do is, now that people have heard

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

this, and once people get their hands on some of it, I'm going to ask defense counsel, if they can, to either submit individual letters, or, hopefully, you'll be able to come to some accommodation where you'll get together and talk about a briefing schedule, and you'll know and be able to suggest to me how much time you need to bring appropriate motions, any motions that you want.

So, for instance, it may be that you will come back to me and say we can't even assess, with this volume, whether we've got suppression motions until X date, but people who want to file suppression motions, defense counsel is in agreement that those motions should be brought not later than X date. Ιf you can't agree, you're welcome to all submit your individual letters to me, and I'll figure something out and go from there, but I'm hopeful that you will be able to either sort yourself into certain groups where you're able to coordinate some of that or to find a person who can assist or volunteer and take -- draw the short straw to act as a coordinator of at least that initial scheduling, because I don't think that we know enough right now to set those dates. I'm suggesting 90 days for suppression motions, but it may be that you need more time than that, I don't know.

The second group of motions would be other motions.

And I separate those, typically. They don't have to be, but I typically separate suppression type motions from other motions.

The reason for that is because, in my view, suppression type motions, you usually are able to assess or evaluate searches that occurred with or without warrants or assess the Title 3 applications or the warrants and/or postarrest statements, the kinds of things that typically lead to suppression motions, relatively easily. I'm not saying they're simple issues to evaluate, but they present a different bucket of issues than review of the entirety of the production to figure out if you've got a motion that's somewhere buried in a thumb drive that was found within a residence. So, I think of this as sort of two separate schedules for motions.

And then what I think people should do is plan on coming back here. I think what we should do is come back here in 60 days, if that sounds like the right kind of time frame, to have another conference. I'll have gotten a letter in the meantime. We'll talk about the date of that letter. It can't be any earlier than six weeks from now, because you won't even have the discovery, and I won't be sure you've even gotten the suppression materials or even begun to understand it. Maybe it should be 75 days from now. I see Ms. Sternheim nodding her head yes, so I am happy to make it 75 days.

MS. STERNHEIM: Only because it would put us in midto late August, and I know some of my colleagues have earned a vacation.

THE COURT: That's fine.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So, why don't we say -- Joe, you'll be looking for a date 75 days from now. Why don't we say that 65 days from now, we're going to have a letter from counsel on a schedule for motions.

Now, this is going to be subject to some adjustment. Obviously, motions would not be expected to be included within that calendar for materials that haven't yet been received. Those are going to be dealt with at a separate time. You're going to be able to bring the motions that you need to bring, that's not the issue. This is just a matter of setting the initial time frames for things. So, let me get a letter on the briefing schedule that will have a proposed briefing schedule for suppression motions and other discovery motions, let me get that 65 days from now, and 75 days from now, we'll actually come in and then talk. I will figure out, between now and then, whether we're going to talk in groups, or maybe you folks will suggest whether it makes sense to talk in groups or whether you've got people who can be designated to talk as primary spokespeople on a couple of issues. Maybe I can get that before the conference. If not, I'll figure it out, but let's get those dates right now.

So, 65 days, Joe?

THE DEPUTY CLERK: July 14th.

THE COURT: July 14th, I would want to get one or any number of letters from defense counsel --

```
1
               Joe, 65 days.
               THE DEPUTY CLERK: August 11th.
 2
 3
               THE COURT: He hasn't had lunch yet. He's very
 4
              I can hear his stomach growling from here.
      hungry.
 5
               So, Joe, what is it?
6
               THE DEPUTY CLERK: August 11th.
 7
               MS. STERNHEIM: Judge, I understand that you just said
8
      75 days.
9
               THE COURT: 65 for the letter.
10
               MS. STERNHEIM: 65 for the letter, but 75. I'm
11
      requesting, on behalf of the defense, that we return after
12
      Labor Day.
13
               THE COURT: Yes, we'll do that. So it won't be quite
      75.
14
          That's fine.
15
               MS. STERNHEIM: Thank you.
               THE COURT: Let's just do something after Labor Day.
16
17
               Why don't we put aside, Joe, we'll need two hours for
      it because I don't know how this is going to sort itself out.
18
               THE DEPUTY CLERK: Friday, September 8th, at 11:00.
19
20
               THE COURT: Friday, September 8th, at 11:00 a.m. for
21
      the conference, and August --
22
               What did you say?
23
               THE DEPUTY CLERK: August 11th.
24
               THE COURT: -- August 11th for the letter or letters.
25
               If you can coordinate on the letter or letters
```

proposing a briefing schedule for motions, the two buckets that I have talked about, terrific. If you cannot, send me your letter by August 11th. I will then put in place a schedule or we'll talk about it, depending on the nature of the letter, at the September 8th conference.

At the September 8th conference, then we will determine a trial date. I don't plan on doing that right now because I don't know how this is going to sort itself out in terms of the duration that you folks are going to need to review all of this discovery, and I think you'll know a whole lot more.

other about potential trial dates on or before September 8th, that would be terrific. If you cannot have those discussions, then what I will do is solicit some input on September 8th, and I will set the trial date using my best judgment. It sounds like there may be a lot -- well, there obviously are going to be a lot of people's calendars to take into consideration, but since we're talking about a trial that I can't imagine occurring sooner than a year, if somebody needed to try it sooner, we would try it sooner, obviously there's a right to a trial sooner, and we'll try it as soon as people want, but I'm anticipating that I'm going to hear from defense counsel that they're going to want a significant amount of time to get ready for this case. So, I'd like to have some proposals, and I

think it's actually easier with people's calendars when we're a year out because they often have scheduled themselves a year out with the same kind of fervor as they schedule themselves for the near-in dates. So, that's why I think setting a trial date should prove actually ironically less difficult than it would if we were trying to do it eight months from now.

So, we won't do that until September 8th, but we'll talk about it September 8th.

Ms. Sternheim.

MS. STERNHEIM: Yes, your Honor. In light of the number of defendants in this case and the case law in the circuit, there would be no way that your Honor would be trying all 30 of us together. If your Honor could request of the government that perhaps they could divide up, as they see best, how they would be handling this, so for purposes of trial dates, we, as a group, could discuss it amongst ourselves?

THE COURT: I think that's a terrific suggestion, and I'll ask Mr. Thomas and Mr. Adams to undertake that. And we've recently had some very good experience with getting people bucketized in the right ways. I think there's an art to it.

But, Mr. Adams and Mr. Thomas, why don't you folks undertake that and share it both with the Court, so I can understand that, as well as with defense counsel. So, sometime sufficiently in advance of September 8th, it would be useful to get those breakdowns in place. And we would, though, I think,

that I've done it before, which actually works pretty well, because if the case ends up narrowing significantly, which may or may not happen, we then can collapse the trials into one.

So, that's what I've done before in very large cases and with over 20 defendants, and we ended up with just a single trial.

So, that's what I think would be the initial plan of action. Other than setting those dates and hearing what I understand will be one bail issue, is there anything else that others who are not associated with the bail issue that I know I have before me, which relates to just one defendant, is there anything else people believe needs to be raised right now? Just identify yourself.

MR. LAZZARO: With respect to my client as far as travel, Judge, she works in the upstate area and would like to expand her ability to travel to work.

THE COURT: Okay. So, what I need is -- I don't understand enough right now. I don't have her piece from probation because I didn't bring it out here with me to understand about travel. Let me just ask for a moment.

Does the government know --

Your client's name is Ms. Gaprindashvili?

MR. LAZZARO: Yes.

THE COURT: Does the government know enough about her circumstances to be able to do this, and just tell me that

there's no objection? If so, I have no reason to interfere right now, but if you need to assess it, then what I would ask is for you folks to get together, write me a letter. If it's on consent, that's easy. If it's not, then I would ask for a fuller presentation of your respective positions.

MR. ADAMS: Your Honor, as phrased, there's an objection, but I imagine we can come to an accommodation.

THE COURT: Why don't you then try to come to an accommodation. Try to do that as quickly as possible since it does relate to the defendant's work, which I assume is an urgent relatively time sensitive issue.

MR. LAZZARO: It is.

THE COURT: But we do need to get that resolved. I can't do it on the fly without having the particular details in front of me.

MR. LAZZARO: I'll speak to the government.

THE COURT: Terrific.

I will act on it as soon as I get something from you folks. So, if I get something from you folks this afternoon, I will act on it. I'll have my clerks call me because I do understand it's an employment issue, and if you folks can come to an agreement that allows the defendant to travel to her work location, even if it's just point A to point B for this period of time, until you work out a fuller agreement, I would be open to that. So, let me know. I'll act on it immediately.

1	MR. LAZZARO: Thank you.								
2	THE COURT: Ms. Sternheim.								
3	MS. STERNHEIM: Yes, your Honor. And this is with the								
4	consent of the government that the travel restrictions for my								
5	client, Mr. Mikheil Toradze, be extended for work purposes to								
6	the District of New Jersey.								
7	THE COURT: All right. Mr. Adams, is that correct?								
8	MR. ADAMS: No objection.								
9	THE COURT: All right. So, his bail term shall be so								
10	modified to include the District of New Jersey.								
11	Is that a seven-day-a-week extension or a Monday								
12	through Friday?								
13	MS. STERNHEIM: Your Honor, the nature of his work is								
14	deliveries, and there are times that there are weekends and								
15	during the week.								
16	THE COURT: All right. So, there won't be a								
17	particular date or time associated with that.								
18	Just identify yourself.								
19	Actually, she was standing up first, and then we'll								
20	get to you. I'm sorry.								
21	MS. NEWMAN: I'm sorry. Donna Newman.								
22	THE COURT: Yes, Ms. Newman.								
23	MS. NEWMAN: On behalf of Akaki Ubilava, I've spoken								
24	to the government, also, about his expanding the travel								
25	restrictions to include New Jersey and Upstate New York. That,								

however, was with the understanding that he would do so on 1 notice to pretrial, explaining where he's going -- the kind of 2 3 notice would include where he's going, when he's going, how long he'll be there, and if for work, the work related to that. 4 5 THE COURT: Okay. 6 MS. NEWMAN: And with notice, also, obviously to the 7 government. THE COURT: That was Ms. Newman for Mr. Ubilava? 8 9 MS. NEWMAN: Right. 10 THE COURT: Is that agreed to, Mr. Adams? 11 MR. ADAMS: Yes, it is. 12 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. Okay. 13 Then we've got Mr. Greenfield. 14 MR. GREENFIELD: Yes, Judge. My client is involved in 15 the same delivery service as Ms. Sternheim's client. going to make the same application to expand his bail 16 conditions. 17 THE COURT: That's for Mr. Kanadashvili? How do you 18 19 pronounce the name? 20 MR. GREENFIELD: Kanadashvili. I get the shvili better than the first part, but I'll 21 22 have it down. Kanadashvili. 23 So, just for the District of New Jersey. I have had 24 conversations with Mr. Adams before. We were unable to

consent. I assume if he agrees with Ms. Sternheim's client, he

25

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1	would	consent	LO My	crrent	•					
2		THE	COURT:	Yes.	Ι	don't	know	the	circumstances	of

3 your client. Let me ask Mr. Adams.

Mr. Adams?

MR. ADAMS: We have no problem, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. GREENFIELD: Thank you, Judge.

THE COURT: So, the bail conditions for

Mr. Kanadashvili are also modified to include the District of New Jersey.

Next, we have Mr. Waldron. I'm sorry, not Mr. Waldron, Mr. Levine.

MR. ADAMS: I'm sorry, your Honor. Before we move to the next, just to clarify, Kanadashvili, that was District of New Jersey for purposes of work only?

THE COURT: For purposes of --

MR. GREENFIELD: Work only?

THE COURT: For purposes of work only. It mirrors the application of Ms. Sternheim, as I understand it.

MR. ADAMS: Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Levine, I think that

Ms. Kellman is also standing up. So, somebody.

MS. KELLMAN: Thank you, Judge.

Earlier this morning, Judge, I got an email from pretrial services suggesting that the bail conditions -- my

client's bail conditions be tweaked a little bit. I have no 1 objection to it. I'm quessing the government has no objection. 2 3 We haven't had a chance to --4 THE COURT: This is for Mr. Davydov? 5 MS. KELLMAN: Yes, your Honor. 6 THE COURT: Is the government aware of the tweaking of 7 the bail conditions? MR. ADAMS: I have not seen any correspondence yet, 8 9 your Honor. I'll speak with Ms. Kellman, and we'll get back 10 with you. 11 MS. KELLMAN: I don't think you'll have any 12 difficulty. 13 THE COURT: Submit them to me, and I will act on it 14 very quickly. 15 Mr. Levine. 16 MR. LEVINE: Judge, I represent Mr. Petrushyn. 17 to let your Honor know I wouldn't be able to appear on September 8th. I'll be attending a capital case seminar in Las 18 19 Vegas, but I'll have somebody stand in. 20 THE COURT: All right. So long as they have your 21 information about trial date and any discovery issues that you 22 may have. 23 MR. LEVINE: Yes. Thank you. 24 THE COURT: All right.

Is there anything else?

25

Let's just take a five-minute break. Let's have everybody who does not need to be involved in the one bail application that we're going to proceed with be able to leave.

Hold on a second, don't everybody get up because it will create chaos with the hearing for the interpreters. As soon as I'm done talking, you can all stand up, otherwise they won't be able to hear anything.

So, everybody can leave except for those individuals, counsel, and parties who are necessary unless there's anything else?

MR. ADAMS: Your Honor, I just ask to exclude time to September 8th, given the complexity of the case, the need to review discovery, produce discovery, for defense counsel to begin considering motions and possible dispositions.

THE COURT: All right. Is there any objection to a request to exclude time between today and September 8th, 2017?

COUNSEL: No.

THE COURT: Hearing no objection, the Court does prospectively exclude time between today and September 8th, 2017, to allow for counsel and their clients to get their arms around this extremely voluminous discovery, to begin discussing the various issues involved in this case and strategy, and to also plan the beginnings of a motion schedule, that those interests are in the interests of justice and outweigh the interests of the defendants and the public in a speedy trial.

So, that time is prospectively excluded. 1 2 Mr. Oksenhendler, you're also standing? 3 MR. OKSENHENDLER: Yes. I'm the defense attorney that 4 is going --5 THE COURT: So, you'll stay with your client. MR. OKSENHENDLER: Can we have 15 minutes? 6 7 THE COURT: It's going to be tough because I've got something that I've got to get to that I'm already late for. 8 9 Do you need it for --10 MR. OKSENHENDLER: I'll deal with it. 11 THE COURT: All right. Let's just take a short break, 12 so that people can leave who don't need to be here, and I'll 13 see everybody who is going to be present for the bail 14 application in five minutes. Thank you. 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25